

### REMARKS

This is a full and timely response to the final Official Action mailed **July 8, 2009** (the "Office Action" or "Action"). Reconsideration of the application in light of the above amendments and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

#### Claim Status:

Claims 19-54 were previously cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. By the forgoing amendment, claims 55 and 56 are cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. No other changes to the claims are proposed by the present amendment. Thus, upon entry of this amendment, only claims 1-18 will be pending for further action.

#### Allowed Claims:

In the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner allowed claims 1-18. Applicant wishes to thank the Examiner for this identification of allowable subject matter.

The recent Office Action also contains a statement of reasons for the allowance of claims 1-18. Applicant agrees with the Examiner's conclusions regarding patentability, without necessarily agreeing with or acquiescing in the Examiner's reasoning. In particular, Applicant believes that the application is allowable because the prior art fails to teach, anticipate or render obvious the invention as claimed, independent of how the claims or claimed subject matter may be paraphrased.

#### Objection to Specification:

In the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner objected to the specification because of an alleged typographical error at the bottom of p. 6. (Action, p. 5).

Specifically, in the heading “Exemplary Implementation and Operation,” the Action properly notes that the first word of this heading should be “Exemplary.”

In the image of the specification in the Image File Wrapper (IFW), the word instead appears as “Ex mplary.” This, however, is merely a scanning error in the IFW. The source document, which was filed in hardcopy, shows the word properly rendered as “Exemplary.” Consequently, there is, in fact, no actual typographical error in the specification at this point.

Nevertheless, in order to expedite the allowance of this application, instructions are given above to render the heading in question to properly read “Exemplary Implementation and Operation.” Therefore, upon entry of the present amendment, the outstanding objection to the specification may be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Prior Art:

Claims 55 and 56 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by, or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over, JP 2002-203576 to Suzkui et al. (“Suzuki”). While Applicant does not agree that claims 55 and 56 are anticipated by, or obvious in view of, Suzuki, in order to expedite the allowance of this application, claims 55 and 56 are cancelled by the present paper. Therefore, following entry of the present amendment, this rejection is rendered moot.

37 C.F.R. §1.116:

If the present amendment is entered, the only claims that will remain are claims 1-18, which have been allowed. Additionally, the only other outstanding issue, i.e., the scanning error on p. 6 of the specification, will have been addressed. Therefore,

following entry of the present amendment, the application will be in clear condition for allowance.

Consequently, entry and consideration of this amendment are proper under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116 for at least the following reasons. The present amendment makes only those changes necessary to place the application in condition for allowance as indicated by the Examiner. The amendment does not raise new issues requiring further search or consideration. And, based on the indications of the Examiner, the present amendment clearly places the application in condition for allowance.

Therefore, entry of the present amendment is proper under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116 and is hereby requested. Following entry of the present amendment, the application will be in clear condition for allowance.

Conclusion:

In view of the foregoing arguments, all claims are believed to be in condition for allowance over the prior art of record. Therefore, this response is believed to be a complete response to the Office Action. However, Applicant reserves the right to set forth further arguments in future papers supporting the patentability of any of the claims, including the separate patentability of the dependent claims not explicitly addressed herein. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed.

The absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment in the Office Action does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede

any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

If the Examiner has any comments or suggestions which could place this application in better form, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned attorney at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

DATE: September 8, 2009

/Steven L. Nichols/  
Steven L. Nichols  
Registration No. 40,326

Steven L. Nichols, Esq.  
Managing Partner, Utah Office  
**Rader Fishman & Grauer PLLC**  
River Park Corporate Center One  
10653 S. River Front Parkway, Suite 150  
South Jordan, Utah 84095

(801) 572-8066  
(801) 572-7666 (fax)